



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Volume II. The End of the Middle Ages. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.

This volume, taken in conjunction with the one preceding,<sup>1</sup> gives a clear idea of the plan of the series as a whole, and makes possible a just estimate of certain excellences and defects in method and execution. A whole period, the Middle Ages, fairly definite as to its nearer boundary, if not as to its farther one, is here rounded out, and the way cleared for a fresh start in the Renaissance. So many otherwise creditable histories of English literature are untrustworthy in the earlier periods that one fancies the editors may have heaved a sigh of relief on having passed these preliminary rocks and shoals. While some difficult channels have been successfully navigated, the keel of the vessel has scraped the rocks occasionally, sometimes with a ruder shock than usual. More than once this has been due to the presence of an inexperienced or imperfectly informed navigator at the helm. The voyager is likely to lose confidence a bit if he perceives the vessel on which he has embarked feeling its way uncertainly through troubled waters. To this reproach, it is fair to say, the second volume is far less open than the first. The editors have been fortunate in securing the services of scholars of distinction for the really important chapters, and there are fewer errors of fact and questionable literary judgments. Typographically, too, the second volume is much better. There is less tendency to bad alignment, although the general appearance of the page in the English edition will probably be more pleasing to the bibliophile. The index at the end is really an assistance, not a source of confusion, as in Vol. I. There is also a better coördination among the different sections. The division of a given subject between two writers is likely to result in omissions or repetitions. For example, it was unfortunate that, in Vol. I, Professor Ker and Mr. Atkins shared the Metrical Romances, and that Professor Jones covered a part of the same field in his chapter on the Arthurian Legends. In the second volume the effort has apparently been made to assign to one person only a topic requiring more than a single chapter. Miss Greenwood writes on Middle English prose, dividing her work into three sections. Mr. Gregory Smith has been entrusted with all the Scottish literature, save the very earliest, which is treated by the Honorable Peter Giles. The collaborative system, to be successful, should be con-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. review of Volume I, by the present writer in this Journal (Vol. VII), pp. 150-160.

trolled in some such way as this. The system worked very badly in the *Cambridge Modern History*, as Mr. Andrew Lang and others have noted. The editors of this sister series may well have profited by that example.

One great defect is noticeable in this as in the first volume,—lack of due proportion in the assignment of space to different authors and periods. The most glaring instance of this is the prominence given to Stephen Hawes, who has an entire chapter to himself,—eighteen pages. Anglo-Saxon national poetry is disposed of in twenty-four pages,—ergo, says the casual reader, Hawes is as important as *Beowulf*. He gets nearly twice as much space as Caxton, Malory, Lord Berners and Froissart together. The “unspeakable Lydgate” (whom he expressed his desire to imitate) was in comparison a poet of infinite variety and piercing eloquence, but Lydgate is given only ten pages. As the last leaf on the tree of Allegory, crumbling and decayed, Hawes has a certain interest, but the best way to treat such a wizened survivor of a long-past summer is to allow it to whistle unmolested on the windy bough to which it clings. William Murison, M. A., of Aberdeen, to whose pen the delineation of the *Passetyme of Pleasure* (ominously named poem!) and the other works has been confided, does not attempt to convince us that Hawes was a notable figure; he cheerfully admits his mediocrity. To take another example, forty-four pages are given to Wycklif. As a great reformer, patriot, and churchman, Wycklif deserves a high place, but surely does not merit as much space in a literary history as Chaucer. (To be just, Chaucer gets two pages more than he.) The literary influence of Wycklif was really not great, as Miss Greenwood acknowledges. Other instances of failure to observe due proportion in the planning of this history might be cited. It is a serious defect; the reader may get in this way a false idea of the relative values of different literary figures and periods.

The volume opens with a chapter by Professor Manly on “Piers the Plowman and its Sequence.” It is safe to say that no other contribution to the book will be read more attentively by scholars than this. For some time past an explanation of the revolutionary theory of multiple authorship put forth in a brief article in *Modern Philology* in January, 1906, has been anticipated with much curiosity. Although the present chapter is far from providing the detailed evidence desirable for forming a final judgment on so difficult a question, and though we must still wait for the promised book, we have here a sufficiently elaborate exposition to show the general trend of the arguments, and make possible some opinion in regard to the general method, if not in regard to details of proof. Professor Manly’s conten-

tions are these: The poem is really the work of five different men. Only one of these is known by name,—Johan But, to whom is ascribed, not only the twelve lines at the end of Passus XII of the A-text, but all of the Passus after l. 56. Passus I-VIII, and Passus IX-XII (1-56) of A are the work of two different persons. The alterations and additions in the B-text and the C-text are due respectively to two other men. The A-version is far superior, especially the early part. The revision in B shows that the redactor was lacking in artistic control and clearness of vision, though endowed with great sincerity and emotional power. The C-version reveals a man of learning, piety, and patriotism, though unimaginative and pedantic. Finally, Professor Manly holds the apparently autobiographical details in the poems to be fictitious, believing "Long Will . . . . . as much a creation of the muse as Piers Plowman."

These conclusions have been criticised in a most interesting article by M. Jussérand in *Modern Philology*, published in January, 1909. This review is considerably longer than the chapter which we are now considering. M. Jussérand, with the greatest urbanity, disagrees categorically with Professor Manly's views, though he gladly acknowledges the importance of the discovery of the misplacement of A 236-259.<sup>1</sup> He will have none of "Johan But," believing the ending of Passus XII, which is preserved only in one ms., a mere scribal impudence, and regarding the four remaining authors with great scepticism. The stylistic and other differences in the text he considers may well be mere variations in the literary work of one man. He makes the most of the fact that one author is not always consistent with his own best work, and that revisions of undoubted authenticity often show changes of style and contradictions of subject-matter. This line of argument is of course familiar from epic criticism. He defends the autobiographical material in general, endeavors to rescue "Kytte and Kalote" from the slurs thrown on them, and closes his argument with the assertion of his belief that, as we

---

<sup>1</sup> In connection with M. Jussérand's remarks about the "lost leaf" should be read Mr. Bradley's note in the *Athenaeum* (Apr. 21, 1906). He proposes to put 236-59 after 145, believing a MS. sheet or note misplaced. Dr. Furnivall has given the weight of his assent to Mr. Bradley's view. The suggestion made by Professor C. F. Brown (*Nation*, Mar. 25, 1909, pp. 298-9) obviates the assumption of a misplaced sheet or a lost leaf. A similar idea had occurred to Mr. T. Hall, (*Modern Language Review*, Oct. 1908), as Professor Brown notes. Decision in regard to this matter is complicated by the fact that Langland's transitions are not invariably easy, and that inconsistencies may appear in work indisputably by one man.

read in one of the mss., "William Langland made Pers Plowman."

It is obviously impossible to enter upon a detailed discussion of so complicated a question here, or to reach a decision quickly when two doctors so eminent disagree. One may be pardoned, perhaps, for feeling that each scholar, in the ardor of the controversy, has somewhat overstated his own case. It is perhaps hardly fair to judge Professor Manly's argument from the evidence thus far submitted, but one feels a certain distrust of the apportionment of the poem among different men upon almost purely stylistic grounds. On the other hand, brilliant as M. Jusserand's eloquence is, and convincing as it sounds, it does not in all cases seem to bear searching examination.

It is unfortunate that Professor Manly could not have published his book first and his general outline and summary of results last. The nature of the contribution to the *Cambridge History* precludes detailed proof and statistical argument, such as is needed in a problem like this. M. Jusserand, on the other hand, is free to adopt these methods whenever necessary. Professor Manly is thus placed at a distinct disadvantage. As for the misplacement of ll. 236 ff., that is obviously explainable on other grounds than the assumption of a lost leaf, while the ingenious hypothesis of a gap containing the Confession of Wrath, etc., on the other part of the leaf is somewhat damaged by Jusserand's criticism. While one may agree with Jusserand that stylistic differences are not necessarily evidences of more than one hand, much depends on the nature and extent of those differences, and the critical treatment of them. The question must still be regarded as an open one, then, although Professor Manly passes, as is natural, from exposition of theory and illustration of matter to assumption of proof, as when he says, "With the recognition that the poems are the work of several authors, etc." (p. 39.) We shall await, with an open mind and lively interest, the appearance of the longer work in which the whole matter is reviewed with the detail which it demands.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the above criticism was written, Professor Manly's reply to M. Jusserand, in *Modern Philology*, July 1909, pp. 83 ff., has much strengthened his position. Here he is able to meet his opponent on his own ground, and make use of the needful controversial detail. He refers again, however, to the publication of future studies on this subject, and indeed it is greatly to be desired that the whole argument should be restated with the elaborateness which it demands, and with due attention to M. Jusserand's attacks. No scholar will grudge an attentive reading of all the evidence, no matter how presented, but it seems likely that Professor Manly will win over a larger number of adherents to his cause

The chapter on religious movements in the fourteenth century, by the Reverend J. P. Whitney, of King's College, is competent, though scarcely distinguished. The discussion of the word "Lollard" (p. 53 f. note) should be compared with that in the *New English Dictionary*. Wicklif's degree is stated to have been possibly "S. T. P.," an academic title not familiar to the reviewer. The reference to an edition by Miss Paues (p. 67) seems out of place in a work in which bibliography is regularly restricted to the appendix. Miss Greenwood's treatment of early Middle English prose, while it perhaps rather exaggerates the merits and importance of Trevisa, is well done. Her summary of the puzzling question of the authorship of *Mandeville's Travels* is almost too cautiously put. The average reader likes a suggestion as to the probable solution of a question so long debated as this. It seems likely that the *Travels* were really written by the Liège physician Jean de Bourgogne "dit à la Barbe," under the assumed name of Mandeville, and highly probable that the disingenuous D'Outremeuse knew more about the business than he gives us to understand. Miss Greenwood's style is not always impeccable, as when she remarks that Mandeville was "great on numbers." One recalls the glee with which English reviewers brand as "Americanisms" such expressions in books written on this side of the water. Chapter XII, in which Middle English prose is continued, is written with a keen feeling for the picturesque; Miss Greenwood makes the figure of Reginald Pecock, that curious combination of heretic and Papist bishop, stand forth most vividly, and she brings out much that is quaint and interesting in the *Paston Letters*. Her knowledge of philological developments seems inaccurate, as when she says (p. 349) "Many a good colloquial expression never found its way into literature; 'to bear on hand' is common for 'to accuse,' 'cup-shotten,' 'shuttle-witted' are good terms." "To bear on hand" is of course common in literary usage a century earlier, in Chaucer and Gower, for example; and "cup-shotten" is found as early as Robert Mannyng's *Chronicle*. Again, such a note as the following is worded with really unpardonable carelessness: "A curious instance of the fluid state of the vocabulary is the use by nearly all the colloquial writers of *me*, short for *men*, or *they*—"causeth me to set the lesse be us"—while scholarly writers are beginning to use it [sic] for *I*, *meseemeth*, etc." (p. 349.)

---

if he presents it somewhat more directly and fully, instead of obliging his readers to follow through his own criticisms of M. Jusserand's criticism of his original work on the poems. In so complicated a matter, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of clearness and conciseness as well as completeness.

The chapter on Chaucer, one of the most important in these earlier volumes, has been allotted to Professor Saintsbury. He has written with enthusiasm and sympathy, and the fact that his interests run in different channels from those usually followed by professed Chaucer students gives his work a certain freshness and independence. His criticism is, as usual, of the impressionistic sort, and he says many good things by the way. Disputed questions are summarized with tolerable accuracy, and disposed of without undue discussion. The bibliography, gathered by Miss Paues, will certainly be useful. It seems, on a hasty examination, well-selected, complete, and free from error, although Professor Tatlock's name is hardly recognizable under the Slavonic disarrangement "Tctolak." The discussion of Chaucer's humor is admirable; here Professor Saintsbury is at his best. Taine's remark, made in another connection, "Il se moque de ses émotions au moment même où il s'y livre" illustrates Chaucer's attitude towards his own serious moments most felicitously. It is interesting to find here something the same view of the *Legend of Good Women* and its prologs as Dr. Goddard has recently advanced in this journal. (Vol. VII, No. 4, pp. 87 ff.) Saintsbury says: "Whether it (the double proem) was really intended as a palinode for abuse of women in earlier books may be seriously doubted; the pretence that it was is quite like 'Chaucer's fun,' and quite like the usual fashion of ushering in literary work with some excuse, once almost universal and still not quite unknown." (p. 201.) Even if Dr. Goddard does not convince us of all his contentions, he has shown us that we have sometimes taken Chaucer a little too seriously. The quarrel as to the sources and priority of the two prologs has reached such minuteness that it is refreshing to hold the book at arm's length for a while, and look at it as a human document, remembering that Chaucer's eye was seldom long without its sly twinkle. The comments on the *Romance of the Rose* may perhaps be a little misleading. It is not "certain that Chaucer translated this very part [B], inasmuch as he refers to it in *The Legend*." The lines in the *Legend* are

Thou hast translated the Romaunce of the Rose,

That is an heresy ageyns my lawe,

And makest wyse folk fro me withdrawe. (329 ff.)

This does not refer specifically to Part B, and further, as Professor Kittredge pointed out, that part of the *Roman* to which the God of Love objects is not in the fragmentary extant version in Middle English. Dr. Goddard explains the situation most ingeniously. (pp. 127 ff.) Professor Saintsbury says that Chaucer "can hardly have written B," but it might be put much more dogmatically. No scholar maintains this nowadays, appar-

ently, with the possible exception of Professor Lounsbury, who seems never to have recanted. The statement that the *Parlement of Foules* has been "not unreasonably connected with the marriage of Richard II to Anne of Bohemia in 1382" is a queer way of putting a clear case. No one has questioned it since Koch's identification in 1877, except Professor Hales, whose argument that the poem is too poor for so late a date will carry little conviction to lovers of Chaucer. The term "rime royal" may be derived from its use in the *King's Quair*, but name and form are more probably of French origin,—as are *ballat royal* and *chant royal*. (p. 195.) There is a little fling at the methods of Professor Skeat, and the "Chaucer canon" (p. 187), although no names are mentioned. Where so much is felicitously expressed, it is disappointing to find stylistic incubi so much in evidence. The effort to write in a vigorous and original way results in unlovely and far-fetched words, "off-signs," "horseplayful," "co-opted," in unmeaning phrases like "temporal colour," and in occasional awkward sentences. As a student of prosody, Professor Saintsbury finds the *Tale of Gamelyn* most interesting, holding that "even for more Chaucer, of which we fortunately have so much already, we could not afford to have no *Gamelyn*, which is practically unique."

The chapter on the English Chaucerians, which follows, is from the pen of the same critic. A less enjoyable task, it has been performed with a good deal of felicity. The discussion of Lydgate is of necessity cautiously handled. The investigation of the Lydgate canon by Dr. MacCracken was not issued in time to be utilized in the body of the book. To judge of Professor Saintsbury's comments in the notes appended to the bibliography (p. 530), he hardly seems inclined to accept its conclusions,—"As it proceeds on the premiss that 'Lydgate was always smooth,' imposes arbitrary rime tests and disqualifies such positive testimony as that of Hawes to his master's work, it is evident that there must be room for considerable difference of opinion as to the probable correctness of this revision." A briefer list of chief works is printed on p. 527. It is interesting to note that Dr. MacCracken deprives Lydgate of *London Lickpenny*, which has always made one feel that Lydgate did on one occasion deviate into sense. Professor Saintsbury is no admirer of the Monk of Bury, reflecting that hardly anything in his work is so good that we should be surprised at his having written the worst stuff credited to his pen. He shows a tendency, indeed, to accept Ritson's characterization of Lydgate as a "voluminous, prosaic, and drivelling monk." Reading Occleve he finds less tedious, since Occleve "has some idea how to tell a story." He sees no poetry in Benedict Burgh, and he credits George Ashby



with having written the "sayings of the philosophers," a singularly felicitous misprint. For some of the spurious Chauceriana he has kindly words, as for *The Second Merchant's Tale*, *The Cuckoo and the Nightingale*, *The Flower and the Leaf*, and *The Court of Love*. The exclusion of the last two from the Chaucer canon has undoubtedly blinded critics to their literary excellence, and it is pleasant to see justice done them here.

The editors have been fortunate in persuading Mr. Gregory Smith to take charge of Scottish literature. There is, perhaps, no scholar living who is more competent to speak with authority on this than he. One chapter, devoted to the Scottish language, contains, in small compass, the essence of Mr. Smith's introduction to his *Specimens of Middle Scots*, now out of print, and hard to obtain. Here once more he takes issue with Michel, who exaggerated absurdly the contribution of France to the Scottish vocabulary. Perhaps Mr. Smith may go a little too far in stressing the direct influence of Latin. The term "aureate style" has been used lavishly but rather vaguely by historians of this period, and one hardly finds it defined more exactly here. There is much need of specialized investigations in the vocabulary and style of Middle Scots.<sup>1</sup>

It has already been said that the discussion of the earliest period is not the work of Mr. Smith. One's first feeling of regret is unjust, since the chapter is so well done. The Huchown puzzle is admirably summarized. Mr. Giles believes that in all probability "Huchown" is to be identified with "the good Sir Hew of Eglintoun," and thinks "of the Awle Ryalle" is "an appropriate enough description for a knight who served for a period as justiciar." (p. 135.) In Chapter XI, after a foreword pointing out how foreign the true Renaissance spirit was to Scotch poets of the fifteenth century, Mr. Smith discusses *The King's Quair*, which he defends against the ill-founded theories that make it the work of some other than James I, or a mosaic, composed by different men. He finds that Dunbar's poems "fall into two main divisions, the allegorical and the occasional." Since such a poem as *The Twa Merrit Wemen and the Wedo* fits neither class, and such a one as *The Goldyn Targe* suits either equally, a more satisfactory separation might be "the artificial and the realistic." Schipper's classification by date of composition, determined through internal evidence, can of course, be only approximately correct. Mr. Smith finds Dunbar less indebted to Chaucer than King James and Henryson were, and perceives "in his wildest frolics an imaginative range which has

<sup>1</sup> Mr. T. M. Wade of Columbia University has in preparation a study of certain aspects of this development, particularly the "aureate termes."

no counterpart in the Southern poet." He assigns *King Hart* to Douglas, without any query or discussion, although the researches of Horneber and Gerken, which are not mentioned in the bibliography, contradict this. In the following chapter he properly emphasizes the importance of the Middle Scots anthologies, and gives a delightfully written summary of this minor verse. He thinks there is a possibility that James I wrote *Peebles to the Play* and *Christ's Kirk on the Green*. Indignation at the critical obtuseness which denies them to King James because they do not happen to resemble the *King's Quair* has, curiously enough, really strengthened the case for the royal authorship in recent years. But there is no direct evidence of any weight. At the end of the chapter vernacular Scots prose in the fifteenth century receives brief mention; it hardly deserves more than this.

Little comment is necessary on the section devoted to Gower. Mr. G. C. Macaulay was obviously the man best qualified to write it, and his summary has the sureness of touch which comes of profound acquaintance with the subject. The works of this poet present no problems comparable to those of the Piers Plowman group or the verse attributed to Lydgate. The treatment here is, then, chiefly descriptive and appreciative. One passage dealing with the relations of Chaucer and Gower may be questioned. Mr. Macaulay rightly dismisses (p. 156) the notion of "a bitter quarrel between the two poets." But he adds: "Chaucer's reference is, apparently, of a humorous character, the author of the not very decent tales of the miller, the reeve and the merchant taking advantage of his opportunity to reprove 'the moral Gower' for selecting improper subjects." There is no reason to suppose that Chaucer was referring to Gower at all; the passage in the Introduction to the Man of Law's Prologue (ll. 77 ff.) contains a slighting reference to the stories of Canacee and Apollonius of Tyre, which are told by Gower, but they were also related elsewhere, and the portion of the latter "that is so horrible a tale for to rede" is, as Dr. Root has noted, not found at all in the Gower version. It is interesting to observe that Mr. Macaulay is not blinded to the shortcomings of his author. He calls him "a man of talent only, not of genius." The *Mirour de l'Homme* is "not without some poetical merit." The plan of the *Confessio Amantis* is "not ill-conceived, but unfortunately, it is carried out without a due regard to proportion in its parts, and its unity is very seriously impaired by digressions which have nothing to do with the subject of the book..... But no previous writer, either in English or in any other modern language, had versified so large and various a collection of stories, or had devised so ingenious and elaborate a scheme of combinations." Scant justice has, indeed, been done Gower in the past by critics,

who, like Lowell, have been repelled by his fatal monotony and pedestrian literary habits. Mr. Macaulay, while recognizing all this, gives him credit for what he deserves.

Mr. E. Gordon Duff has a chapter in which the main facts about the early work of the printing-press are brought together in a business-like way. Gerard Leeu, it may be noted, appears on p. 357 as "General" Leeu. There are two or three errors, too, in the Reverend T. R. Walker's treatment of Universities and Public Schools in the Middle Ages, although in the main it appears satisfactory. Wat Tyler's insurrection was in 1381, not 1318, (p. 393), and the quotations on pp. 398 and 413 are disfigured by misprints ("covertise" for "coveitise," and "the' olde Esculapius").

The volume closes with three chapters treating the lyric, the ballad, and the political and religious verse to the close of the fifteenth century. Professor Padelford's discussion of the transitional English song collections may well encourage students to specialized study in this delightful field. The Middle English lyric has hitherto received far less attention than it deserves, the metrical romances and the ballads having proved superior attractions to most scholars. Here the leading types of songs in the collections are described, with frequent illustrations. The time is probably not yet ripe for a treatment of the Middle English lyric as a whole; but when that time does come, it is to be hoped that the work may fall to a scholar as careful and as appreciative as Professor Padelford here shows himself to be. The ballad problems, while perhaps not yet settled, present more clearly defined issues. Readers of Professor Gummere's works will find little that is new in his summary here, but it is most convenient to have his well-known theories condensed in this confession of faith. The communal hypothesis is tersely and vigorously stated, and the different types of ballad and lines of development are briefly summarized. Professor Gummere calls no truce to the theories which explain the ballad as a later development, and, indeed, he has no reason to do so, since modern investigation tends more and more to discredit them. A very pretty debate might have been arranged with one of the most distinguished contributors to this volume, Mr. Gregory Smith, whose scepticism in regard to the "folk-theory" is well-known, had the plan of this series afforded space for flytings. Such arguments as Mr. Smith's set forth in *The Transition Period*, in Saintsbury's series, are vigorously attacked,—although no names are mentioned—with the conclusion that "one is compelled to dismiss absolutely the theory of minstrel authorship, and to regard ballads as both made and transmitted by the people." The characteristic absence of conscious artistry in the ballads is deftly

brought out at the end of the chapter. Such a contribution as this reveals, as scarcely anything else could, the manifold advantages of having each section of such a history as this executed by a specialist, rather than by an industrious person of some general literary equipment and fluency in writing.

Mr. Waller himself utters the valedictory to the Middle Ages in Chapter XVIII. It makes the impression of being somewhat repetitive; we are reintroduced to Anglo-Norman chronicles and histories, the political verse is treated briefly, and lyrics and carols, which Professor Padelford had discussed, are again brought up. The summary of the literary significance of the fifteenth century does not agree with that given earlier in the volume by Professor Saintsbury. The quotation of "the demesnes that here adjacent lie" (not quite accurately cited) as representing "the stately pleasure-houses of Chaucer and the Elizabethans" is less effective if one remembers the context of the original. Advantage has been taken of some extra space to insert in the bibliography to this closing chapter considerable miscellaneous information for which no place could elsewhere be found. These elaborate bibliographies are a most valuable feature of this series, affording a convenient and detailed summary of criticism up to date.

On reviewing these two volumes once more, one realizes, with gratitude to the editors for their difficult and wearisome task, that nowhere else is there such a complete and scholarly treatment of literature in England in the Middle Ages, and of the contributory facts which shaped and developed that literature.

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE.

*Columbia University, March, 1909.*

---

THE VALIANT WELSHMAN, by R. A. Gent. Nach dem Drucke von 1615 herausgegeben von Dr. Valentin Kreb. (*Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie*, hrsg. von Breymann und Schick. Heft 23) Erlangen & Leipzig, 1902. Pp. lxxvii+88.

*The Valiant Welshman* is an interesting play; not because of intrinsic merit, but because it gives one the pleasure of recognition and identification. The faces of old friends are continually in evidence. Besides specific reminiscences of Shakespeare, Jonson, Kyd, and Spenser, the whole play is a conglomeration of conventional scenes and stage-business. The author must have written out of a familiarity of many years with the Elizabethan stage. Nothing seems original, but rather is it a *mélange* of all